



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/781,748	02/12/2001	Arun K. Subramaniam	S838.12-0001	8939

7590 10/20/2003

David R. Fairbairn  
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING  
312 South Third Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002

EXAMINER

ELISCA, PIERRE E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3621

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
**09/781,748**

Applicant(s)  
**Arun, Subramaniam**

Examiner  
**Pierre E. Elisca**

Art Unit  
**3621**



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/30/2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 3621

**DETAILED ACTION**  
**RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT**

1. This Office action is in response to Applicant's amendment, filed on 06/30/2003.
2. Claims 1-20 are pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103 (a)***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (U.S. pat. No. 5,884,272) in view of Calamera et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,463,533).**

As per claims 1, 2, 5-8, and 10-20 Walker substantially discloses a system/method for establishing anonymous communications includes a plurality of party terminals, a plurality of requester terminals, and a central controller (or privacy agent) (which is readable as Applicant's claimed invention wherein it is stated that a system for anonymous transactions), the system comprising:

a plurality of web servers for hosting transactions between verified users (see., abstract , fig );

a web portal, the web portal having a connection with the internet (see., fig 1, item 400, col 7, lines 29-48) ;

**Art Unit: 3621**

a plurality of data stores for storing the transactions (see., fig 2A). Walker further discloses a credit card transaction (see., col 19, lines 51-61). It is obvious to realize that email is an object in the Internet.

It is to be noted that Walker fails to explicitly disclose that his anonymous transaction is for maintaining transactional anonymity between user and WEB SERVERS or WEB SITES. However, Calamera discloses a system for allowing a computer network site or web site to recognize an anonymous user without revealing the identity of the user (see., abstract, col 11, lines 4-21, col 12, lines 9-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the anonymous communications of Walker by including the limitation detailed above because such modification would provide the anonymous communications of walker with the enhanced capability of determining the user identity from the web site.

As per claim 3, Calamera discloses the claimed limitations wherein the privacy agent or controller comprises a software component stored on a computer, the software agent being in network communication with each web server, the software agent programmatically monitoring text messages between the web postal and the web servers (see., abstract, col 11, lines 4-21, specifically wherein it is stated that alias maintains the user's identity or anonymity).

As per claims 4, and 9 Calamera discloses the claimed limitations wherein programmatically interfering with text messages includes temporarily preventing a message from reaching the web

**Art Unit: 3621**

servers until a sender of the message authorizes disclosure of the private data (see., col 11, lines 4-21, specifically wherein it is stated that a website receives an alias which it recognizes as associated with a disruptive user, the website can deny or block (or authorize or unauthorized) access to the user).

### **RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS**

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 06/30/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

### **REMARKS**

6. In response to Applicant's arguments, Applicant argues that the prior art of record (Walker 272") does teach or suggest:

a. hosting transactions between verified or validated users as required. As stated above, Walker discloses this limitation in the abstract, lines 3-8, specifically wherein said the system receives and stores party data about respective parties. Upon receiving criteria for parties of interest from a requestor terminal (or user) and authorization (or verification) from respective parties, the central controller releases to the requester party associated with the parties. Please note that this process is readable as hosting transactions between verified or validated users.

b. Applicant also argues that the Office action mailed on 04/20/2003 misstated the teachings of the Calamera patent. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees because Calamera discloses in the

Art Unit: 3621

abstract, col 11, lines 4-21, col 12, lines 9-24 that a system for allowing a computer network site or web site to recognize an anonymous user without revealing the identity of the user.

*Conclusion*

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Pierre Eddy Elisca at (703) 305-3987. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday to Friday from 6:30AM. to 5:00PM.

If any attempt to reach the examiner by telephone is unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on (703) 305-9768.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

The Official Fax Number For TC-3600 is:

**(703) 305-7687**

  
Pierre Eddy Elisca

Patent Examiner

**October 15, 2003**